

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12-17 are pending in the above application.

The Office Action dated February 26, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed. Each issue raised in that Office Action is addressed below, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12-17 is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bottini in view of Kudo and further in view of Takada. Bottini illustrates opto-isolators having lead frames with several leads. The leads include first portions having a first pitch and second portions having a second pitch, and the first and second portions are joined end to end. As acknowledged in the Office Action, Bottini does not show or suggest other limitations of claim 1, namely that the pitch of the first leads corresponds to a pitch of terminals of a surface mount type electronic device and the pitch of the second leads corresponds to a pitch of terminals of a through hole mount type device. Kudo is cited to show a device having leads separated by different pitches; Takada is cited to show that the pitch of DIP type mounts is 2.54 mm and that the pitch of SOP mounts is 1.27 mm. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Bottini based on the Kudo and Takada in order to produce the invention of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that a proper motivation for modifying Bottini has not been provided, that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented, and that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record for at least this reason.

First, it is submitted that the stated motivation for combining the references has been taken, impermissibly, from the present disclosure. The stated motivation is "to accommodate the SOP and DIP packaging." None of the art of record suggest the use of different lead pitches on a single leadframe to accommodate two types of packaging. This is only taught by the present disclosure. If the examiner believes that this teaching comes from the art of record, it is respectfully requested that the alternate source of this teaching be identified by reference, column and line number. Otherwise, it is submitted that this statement of motivation cannot be used to support the present rejection.

Furthermore, Kudo teaches the use of different lead pitches to provide additional dielectric strength when working with a device consuming large amounts of power or generating

large amounts of heat (column 1, lines 32-42). Larger pitches may be desirable for insulating those heat generating leads. For other leads, smaller pitches may be desirable to allow more leads to fit into a given area. Nothing in Bottini suggests that such high power or high heat issues need to be addressed. Because the problem addressed by Kudo is not present in Bottini, one skilled in the relevant arts would have no reason to provide Bottini with leads having two or more different pitches as shown in Kudo.

Even if Bottini suffered from problems that required increased lead spacing, Kudo's approach would not provide a solution. This is because Kudo teaches different lead spacing to control the amount of dielectric material between leads. Nothing suggests that this can or should be done with first and second leads joined end to end as in Bottini - changing the pitch of the Bottini's second leads would not affect the amount of dielectric material between the first leads, for example. In view of these differences, it is respectfully submitted that nothing about the Kudo reference suggests any desirable modification to Bottini. Takada, which merely identifies dimensions of SOP and DIP devices, does not provide any further suggestion for a modification.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented and that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bottini in view of Kudo and Takada and further in view of Kazutaka. Claim 12 recites a leadframe having a plurality of parallel first leads each having a first length, a first width and a first thickness, the first leads having a first pitch corresponding to a pitch of terminals of a surface mount-type electronic device, and a plurality of parallel second leads each having a second length, a second width, a second thickness and a second pitch corresponding to a pitch of terminals of a through hole mount-type electronic device, wherein the first leads are joined end to end with the second leads. As argued above in connection with claim 1, a proper motivation for modifying Bottini based on Kudo and Takada has not been provided. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented in connection with claim 12. Takada does not address the shortcomings of Bottini, Kudo and Takada. Claim 12 is

submitted to patentably distinguish over the art of record for at least this reason.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bottini in view of Kudo and Takada and further in view of Kazutaka. Claim 15 recites a plurality of parallel first leads arranged in a plane, each of the first leads having a first thickness in a direction normal to the plane and the plurality of first leads having a first pitch corresponding to a pitch of terminals of a surface mount-type electronic device and a plurality of parallel second leads arranged in the plane, each of the second leads having a second thickness in the direction normal to the plane less than said first thickness and the plurality of second leads having a second pitch corresponding to a pitch of terminals of a through hole mount-type electronic device and different than said first pitch, wherein the first leads are joined end to end with the second leads. As argued above in connection with claim 1, a proper motivation for modifying Bottini based on Kudo and Takada has not been provided. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been presented in connection with claim 15. Takada does not address the shortcomings of Bottini, Kudo and Takada. Claim 15 is submitted to patentably distinguish over the art of record for at least this reason.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bottini in view of Kudo and Takada and further in view of Kazutaka. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Kazutaka does not address the shortcomings of Bottini, Kudo and Takada discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 2 is therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated February 26, 2007, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12-17 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/690,615
Amendment dated April 17, 2007
After Final Office Action of February 26, 2007

Docket No.: 0951-0127P

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted;

By  #37,750

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant